UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2001, 3:00 p.m.
HOLMES STUDENT CENTER SKYROOM

THOSE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT: Baker, Burgess, Butler, Caldwell, Carson, Carter, Cearlock, Coover, Curley, Ganesan, Graf, Goldenberg, Gotthardt, Gregory, Gresholdt, Griffiths, Henry, Ilsley, Jennings, Kafer, Kasuba, King, Kolb, Kowalski, Larson, Legg, Martin, K. Miller, R. Miller, Mini, Miranda, Mohabbat, Morris, Musial, Orem, Pavia Perez, Povlsen, Richmond, Rubin, Schuth, Spear, Stalker, Wheeler, Williams, Willis, Wolfskill, Young, Zar,

K. Gately-Poole attended for D. Bilder. F. Smith attended for F. Kitterle. Scott Bauman attended for D. Wade.

THOSE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Conde, Creamer, Garcia, Harris, Jones, Kaplan, Lockard, McCuistion, Pernell, Ridnour, Simon, Song, Sorensen

I. CALL TO ORDER

President Peters called the meeting to order.

II. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

President Peters called for a motion to approve the agenda. Approval was moved and seconded.

The agenda was approved by voice vote.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 2, 2001 MEETING

President Peters asked for a motion to approve the Minutes of the May 2, 2001 meeting. Approval was moved and seconded.

The minutes were approved by voice vote.

President Peters: I do see that we have a new addition to the minutes. Sue Willis has excerpted them and prepared a concise summary. Thank you. That’s a great addition.

IV. PRESIDENT’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Peters: I had a series of campus items that I would normally go through, but I thought what I would do is read to you my second message to the campus community that should be posted on our Web site by now, about the events of yesterday. After that, if you have questions we have people here who can discuss what we’ve done, what is being done, what we plan to do so that we all feel that we’ve done everything we can to deal with this tragic event. I
Yesterday we experienced events in our nation that shook us to the core. “America Under Attack” and “National Tragedy” were headlines for the day, and for once I think it was impossible to overstate the case. I fully expect to find in coming days, and I’ve already found out, that some of members of our University community had friends, colleagues and perhaps even family members involved in yesterday’s incident. Our hearts go out to them and to all those whose lives have been touched by this great evil. Yesterday morning, I convened our crisis team to deal with our most immediate considerations. First, we made sure that all of our own emergency preparedness procedures were in place to ensure the safety and security of our students, faculty and staff. When we were satisfied that safety issues had been fully addressed and our plans were in place, we quickly moved on to the issue of possible class cancellations. Now under the best of circumstances, this is not an easy decision. Yesterday’s events, clouded as they were under a haze of shock and disbelief, did not immediately reveal the best paths to take as we watched buildings explode before our eyes. However, it did not take long for our campus leadership, broad-based leadership on the crisis management team, to come together on this issue. We believe that terrorism has at its heart the attempt to disrupt. To the extent that we can resist those attempts, we will. It was our unanimous decision to manifest that belief by continuing with established class schedules yesterday at NIU. At the same time, we knew some faculty, with direct connections to the tragedy, were choosing to cancel classes. In the statement I released yesterday, I made it clear that we needed to respect those very personal and individual decisions. Now similarly, I have asked faculty to extend the same privilege to students who chose not to attend class yesterday. It may be many weeks, it will be many weeks before we know the full extent of these events, and certainly beyond, and all of their connections to our campus community. In all of these decisions, we’ll let compassion be our guide and compassion should be our guide in the weeks to come. Our students and other members of our campus community have already come forth in great numbers to express that compassion. Blood drives being held today around campus have brought out many people who want to help. I understand there’s over a three-hour wait if you want to give blood, and students were queueing up in the a.m. to give blood, as were faculty and staff. Counselors posted in the residence halls last night worked past 1:00 a.m., helping many of our younger students deal with the grief, confusion and concern that followed the day’s events. Beginning this afternoon and continuing through the end of this week, discussion groups have been set up at Holmes Student Center to allow members of our campus community to give full expression to their feelings in a supportive atmosphere. This evening, under the leadership of Troy Caldwell, our Student Association president, our students are holding a prayer vigil at 8:00 p.m. in Central Park near Stevenson and Douglas residence halls and then I understand there’ll be a walk to MLK commons. We are doing what we can and working hard to take care of each other. I urge our faculty, and I don’t have to urge very hard, and our staff to make this a learning moment for our students. I know my first reaction yesterday was to get into the classroom and discuss this, but I could not do that. I knew faculty would. To the extent possible, I would encourage faculty to allow and even facilitate discussions in class and to encourage students to express opinions about this national tragedy. At the same time, I would hope our instructors take the opportunity to infuse those discussions with meaning, tolerance, understanding, and appropriate response. These are issues that should be part of any
discussion about yesterday’s events. Most of all, it is an opportunity for all of us to reflect on what it means to be an American with our commitment to freedom, to individual liberty, to compassion, to tolerance and to a sense of fairness and how that identity should guide our responses to those events. Great universities have always been at the forefront of national discourse. Never have they been more needed than at this moment in our history. It is from our great institutions of higher learning, including NIU, that tomorrow’s leaders will emerge. Let us do all we can to ensure that those future world leaders will remember not just where they were when they heard of the events of September 11th but also what they learned and how they grew in the days that followed. That’s the statement I have put on the Internet.

Now we’ve had a great many people who have done yeoman work; our staff, and our counselors who are themselves in need of compassion and overworked. So, I’m really pleased at the way this university has responded and universities all across the country have responded. If anyone wants to make a comment or ask questions, Gary Gresholdt is here from Student Affairs who can answer questions about student activities. After this meeting, I’m going to go back and we are making decisions about athletic events, which is complicated interactive decision-making because the NCAA is caucusing to decide what to do. The various athletic conferences and the individual schools are caucusing, and we will make a decision relatively shortly. The check-lists of things to look at is long and, indeed, we looked at all university-sponsored student and other activities to determine their appropriateness, what the constituent group wants to do and what our counsel is. We’re doing the best we can. I think the best thing we can do right now is discuss these things in our classes and in our residence halls and not just move beyond, because my own personal belief is that this is an event that we will never move beyond. We need to begin to understand and adapt to this and I believe we will forever be changed in some measure because of this. Does anybody want to comment or does any of the administration want to add anything? I know from a report from the deans at the Dean’s Council this morning that very few classes were cancelled. My own walk-arounds yesterday with students indicated the full range of emotions that those of you who are faculty have experienced. There’s also a sense of wanting to get on and I’ve received many calls from parents, some of them angry about our not canceling classes, and I can understand that. They were concerned and yet I think we made the only decision we could under the circumstances.

P. Henry: Since I teach Indonesian and Indonesia is the largest Muslim country in the world, I had a special concern that I tried to express in my class about people over reacting towards Muslim groups on campus. Do you have any notion if that is a problem or is there something special that needs to be addressed in that regard?

President Peters: Well, I think there are seven million American citizens who embrace the Muslim faith and I know that around the country people are concerned about this. I read in the Tribune this morning there were a few incidents. Last night there was a Muslim open house at the mosque and I think that went off without incident. I think that this is a campus and a community that has shown tolerance and I try to imbed that in my letter without being very specific about it. But, you can be sure that we have thought and tried to think of all groups and their sensitivity and the issues, and our International Student Association has done yeoman work in this; and Manfred Thullen and his a group. All the groups have come together. We need to preach tolerance and fairness and careful response because there are those who are angry. My
own son called and said if things were as clear as Pearl Harbor he would have been signing up today and we both agreed, but what would we be signing up for at this point? So there is anger out there and frustration, but let’s first turn to understanding and education and deal with the grief that has resulted from this. Yes, Gary Gresholdt? Thank you, Gary, for your people’s work.

G. Gresholdt: In response to your question, our Counseling and Student Development Center is in the process of reaching out to our international students and also to our Muslim students because all of our students, whether or not they’re from the United States, regardless of their religion or religious preference, are experiencing a wide range of feelings and it’s important that they have opportunities to discuss the feelings and emotions that they’re experiencing right now. So, we’re trying to reach out to various populations. As the President mentioned, there is a series of discussion groups that are being set up and some will be set up specifically for Muslim students and for international students. But I think as you encounter students who are experiencing difficulties right now, you might refer them to the Counseling and Student Development Center. That office is prepared to talk with them and to work with them.

President Peters: Just a couple of other introductions. I’d like to formally introduce our new Executive Vice President and Provost, Ivan Legg. Ivan, welcome, and you already have woven yourself into the fabric of the institution and visited many faculty and students and we’re very pleased to have you. You’ve been invaluable already in this school year. I think you have some introductions.

Provost Legg: We have two new deans. Shirley Richmond is the Dean of Health and Human Sciences; would you stand up in the back? Glad to have you here. Chris Sorensen is the acting Dean of Education. Chris, are you here? We’ll say thanks to her anyway.

President Peters: Very good. I know that if Chief Grady were here, Dr. Williams would introduce him but he is occupied at the time. I’d say the Chief has already made his presence felt on the campus, particularly yesterday. It’s comforting to have someone who’s had experience in Kosovo walk into the Crisis Management group. One or two other business things that I would like to mention. We are releasing today our enrollment report. Basically, our enrollment has increased for the fifth straight year. Over the past two years it has increased by over a thousand students and there will be a press release. I’ll just give you some of the basic figures. The analysis is yet to come. Our total enrollment, and this is the number we will now officially use for all reports and media inquiries, our total enrollment that is on campus, off campus, graduate, undergraduate, is 23,783, almost 23,800. That’s up about 2.45%, an increase of 535. We have a total undergraduate student population of 17,468. That’s up about 317, almost 2% over last year. A lot of that is that the number of new freshman is up slightly, the number of transfers is up slightly, and it also reflects the tracking through of larger classes in the last two or three years and then the passing through the institution of smaller classes of a few years ago. We don’t know whether that’s related to rate of retention or not but that’s where we are. Total graduate population is over 6,000; it is 6,012. That breaks out as follows: the biggest increase at this point is for our on-campus graduate student enrollment, which is 3,883, an increase of 243 or 6.7%. That’s very robust and there are a lot of reasons for that and that certainly runs with the cycle of the economy. When the economy is down; graduate enrollment is up. We never do get
a very good fix on off campus graduate enrollment this early because registration is ongoing and you don’t know until about September 17th. That’s the last date to register I think for the fall term. So, in general we’re up about 4% in graduate enrollment. A few characterizations: 31% of entering freshmen are minorities, which is something we worked for and expected. This year’s entering class contains the largest ever number of Latino freshmen. Out of state student numbers went up by about 50 this year, but that is not significant. Most of our students are in state students. We had a very, very good increase in the number of individuals in our Honors Program. We had an increase of 45% in our Honors Program and that fits our strategic plan. So, we’ll be digesting those raw numbers and determining what they mean and this feeds into a committee that Provost Legg is chairing which is an undergraduate enrollment committee looking at the various aspects of our enrollment: who are our students, where do they come from? As I indicated when I talked to you last year in my first State of the University address we need to get involved in enrollment management. This is very good news for us. Other universities in the state are losing enrollment or maintaining. We are one of those institutions that are increasing quite nicely. Illinois State also has a decent increase. The University of Illinois, Springfield had a very large freshmen class, this is the first time they’re taking freshmen. So now they are a full four-year institution and not a junior/senior institution, and probably their marketing area is more competitive with that of Southern Illinois University and Illinois State.

The only other thing I wanted to mention is that on October 4th, at 3:00 p.m. in Holmes Student Center, I will be giving the annual State of the University address where a lot of the things I would normally have said today about our budget and prospects will be addressed in that speech. So far (knock on wood), the financial health of the institution is solid and let me give you one external validator of that. This summer, and it’s not a very exciting thing to hear, but it’s very exciting to us, Moody Investors Service, that evaluates bond ratings, upgraded our bond rating which means we can borrow at a lower rate for our bond revenue situations. Now we are the highest rated university in terms of bond rating right behind the U of I and that’s thanks to Eddie Williams and his people, like Kathe Shinham, and the good work that they do. A lot of that has to do with faith in an institution and its ability to handle its resources. It’s difficult for universities, particularly in the state of Illinois, to get outstanding bond ratings because the state does not permit us to carry reserves beyond emergency levels. Of course, if you carry reserves that balances against your bond indebtedness. We also refinanced our bonded indebtedness because it was the time to do it this summer, and Dr. Williams’ people saved us a lot of money in terms of our payments and gave us some room to borrow some more money to finish off some of our emergency renovation and maintenance projects. I think that’s all I’m really going to say today and if we have other questions we can wait until the end of the meeting. So now I think we will move to the approval of the Consent Agenda.

V. CONSENT AGENDA

President Peters: The Consent Agenda has two items. Is there a motion to approve the Consent Agenda?

The Consent Agenda was approved.

A. Approval of University Council Committees for 2001-2002
B. Approval of Dan Griffiths to serve on the University Advisory Committee of the Board of Trustees – 2001-2004.

VI. REPORTS FROM COUNCILS, BOARDS AND STANDING COMMITTEES

A. FAC to IBHE – Wilma Miranda

W. Miranda: I’m reporting for two months, the May meeting and the June meeting of the FAC. The May meeting was held here at Northern. The President had hoped to be with us to greet us but that was not possible and Lynne Waldeland was here and talked with the FAC for a considerable length of time. We didn’t have much of a business meeting at that particular time of the year and I just want to say for the record that Lynne was very impressive, very helpful and interested. She didn’t intend to make a speech, but she ended up having a long discussion with the FAC members about higher ed policy and about challenges to higher education. She really made a good impression on the FAC. They had a good meeting here on campus. Everybody helped; I want to thank Donna, particularly; without her I would’ve probably been the worst hostess, but she was wonderful in supporting us. The only item of interest possibly to you from the business portion of that meeting was a proposal from the community-college representatives that the community college representatives on the FAC increase their membership to equal the representation from the state universities. There are fewer members and the proposal was tabled until our June meeting, and we did not discuss it for any length of time.

Our June meeting was held at Augustana College on June 8th and we were greeted by Dean Richard Jurasek. He focused his remarks on the importance of shared governance at all levels of higher education, both in the state-wide higher-ed policy arena and on local campuses, praising the work in particular of the FAC in contributing to the difficult task of assuring – the always difficult task – of assuring that higher education would not become a pyramid with the faculty at the bottom. The morning meeting was devoted to the presentation of the MERLOT Project; sounds like a wine but it’s not. It’s The Multi-media Educational Resource for Learning and Online Teaching. It is a project designed so that faculty from around the world will share teaching and learning materials and pedagogies. The attempt is to create a peer-reviewed environment, which will provide recognition for innovative teaching and learning. At the business meeting we welcomed our new chair, James Anderson, from the University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign and established a schedule of meetings which I have, you probably don’t want to hear them all, for this academic year. The Quality of Higher Education subcommittee presented its position paper on non-tenure track faculty, which was approved by the FAC to be forwarded to the Illinois Board of Higher Ed. There was a lengthy and very heated discussion about the representation of community college members on the FAC, about enlarging that membership. There is an Illinois Community College Board and there are other avenues for community college faculty to have some input, but there was, I think, a concern on the part of community college faculty members that they weren’t equal partners and weren’t perceived to be that way by other members on the committee, and some of the politics in higher education going on in terms of community-college interest in teacher education and community-college self-assertion came forward. In the end, the FAC voted to grant that proposal and so they’re looking at some change of membership on the FAC in the future.
The next meeting of the FAC will be at Wheaton College on October 2nd. That will be the meeting with the Illinois Board of Higher Education.

**President Peters:** Are there questions for Wilma?

**J. Zar:** You mentioned upcoming changes in the membership of the FAC. Could you remind us what the current membership consists of?

**W. Miranda:** The current membership consists of some permanent members. Those institutions with permanent members are the University of Illinois and others of what they call big state universities. There are rotating memberships for private universities, the large private universities including the University of Chicago, and I believe Northwestern is another. There are rotating memberships for all of the colleges in the state so that their representatives are on for three years. I believe the community-college representatives are on for two years; I’m not sure of that. They’re rotating memberships because there are so many more of them. The membership, as was intended, is dominated by public universities of the state; the state university system and then private universities have representation and then community colleges. Those are the three constituencies.

**H. Rubin:** You mentioned that the community colleges gained some more power through a vote. We read in the newspapers about the educational certification. We’ve read in the newspapers about community colleges, either independently or through liaisons, basically turning into four-year schools; are we looking at that someplace in this university to see the implications for us?

**W. Miranda:** We’re sure looking at it in the College of Ed. I can tell you that.

**President Peters:** Is there a collective faculty UAC view on this? I’ve not really talked to faculty about that particular constellation of issues. I can guess what it is.

**W. Miranda:** As an individual, I think that we’re seeing through the standards movement, the performance outcomes stuff, the teacher-education renewal movement; we’re seeing a really serious, a deep, restructuring of the relationship among different institutions in higher ed today. For example, the community colleges bring kind of a Boyer model conception of the faculty; what the professoriate is or ought to be. There are some really profound implications at all levels here about what it’s going to mean to be an institution of higher ed and how higher-education institutions inter-relate with one another and how they partner and how they share. So, it’s not surprising that each of these sectors rethinks its own role and that it would show up this way in some of these forms. What the outcome is or how to look at it, or the complexities of it, I really don’t feel prepared to comment on. I do think it is something that we’ve talked about it in complying with external agencies and certification requirements and so forth to see how we fit into those and how we can best position ourselves in being responsible to these changes, but I don’t think we’ve really talked internally on most campuses about what it means, at least the matters I mentioned.

**R. Wheeler:** I’ve talked with a number of community college leaders in recent months. I do not
detect any indication that at the present time Illinois public community colleges are interested in offering four-year degree programs. What I think does interest them is the possibility that the senior institutions might be willing to offer baccalaureate completion programs on their campuses. That I think would definitely engage their interest if we wanted to pursue it.

Provost Legg: In fact we are already looking into those possibilities.

President Peters: Well, the landscape in Illinois post-secondary education is such that the state has invested in good quality public universities and one rather large research public university. The state has invested in a large student aid program, the MAP Program, that benefits public and private post-secondary education, and it has invested in very solid academic-oriented community colleges that have support both from the state and local tax provisions for its revenues, and they do a very good job. Northern Illinois has worked hard at its articulation agreements with community colleges and dual articulation agreements. I think we have 19 or 20. We lead the state. We depend on the community colleges for our transfer students, which are 40% of our enrollment. Nonetheless, my position is to ask who has the quality and ability and the expertise to deliver certain kind of degrees, and I think that’s where the strong ground is. Clearly we have a situation in Illinois where the community colleges are important; they’re in every legislative district and they serve their populations well. We also know there are needs out there that some people say are not being met. Degree-completion programs, educational markets, (I’m using corporate language because that’s the way the argument is framed) that aren’t being reached, and someone has to reach those and community colleges say they’re willing and the public universities are stretched. We are stretched to meet those needs. So, this bears some watching. I’d be very interested in a private conversation to find out the voting calculus, by the way, on how the vote went through on giving equal representation to the community colleges.

B. BOT Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Personnel Committee – Dorothy Jones

President Peters: Sue Willis is going to report.

S. Willis: Dorothy Jones was not able to attend that meeting so I attended in her place being as I was attending the next committee meeting the next hour anyway. The committee met last Friday, September 7th, at 9:00 a.m. There was only one action item on the agenda, which was endorsing the various collective-bargaining agreements on the campus. There were quite a few information items, some of which were actually action items in the next meeting, so I will mention those. A survey of undergraduate alumni was done to see how they were doing, whether they had gotten jobs and whether their jobs were in their fields of study and that kind of thing and also how satisfied they were with their undergraduate experience here at NIU; and all of those results were very positive. I assume copies of this are available.

President Peters: Yes, probably from Virginia Cassidy.

S. Willis: There was some information about the conversion to PeopleSoft. I thought it was interesting that the PeopleSoft company wants to use NIU as a success story, which kind of makes you wonder what their failures look like. But anyway, as you know, we’re learning to live with this.
President Peters: It wasn’t a very full agenda.

C. BOT Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee – Sue Willis and Jim Lockard

President Peters: There was so much there, that both Sue and Jim are giving their report.

S. Willis: I think it’s just me. The Finance, Facilities and Operations Committee met last Friday at 10:00 a.m., well, actually it was about 10:30 by the time they got to it but there were a number of action items for this committee all of which passed. There was the fiscal year ’03, which starts on July 1, 2002, capital budget. This is the listing of our top priorities of what we’d like the state to fund, and I’m told there are nine items on this list and typically we get between one and three of them. Number 1 was some planning money for upgrading the Stevens Building.

Number 2 was some equipment for Barsema Hall. We received, as I’m sure you all know, a donation for the building itself but not necessarily all the things that have to go inside it. Number 3 was some planning funding for Phase II improvements on Wirtz Hall, and Numbers 4 through 9 are probably not going to get funded this year, although I do have a list.

President Peters: Be more optimistic.

S. Willis: I have a list if people are interested. I’m just going by what Eddie told me. Then there was the FY03 non-appropriated budget. This is for non-instructional facilities most of which are funded mostly by revenue bonds, for smaller budget items and for improvements in various parts of the physical plant around campus. There’s a report on how we’re spending the FY02 budget; what the revenue and expenses are. There is a request for an increase in the budget for a utility tunnel that’s going to Barsema Hall and which turned out to be deeper and more complicated than they thought. There are some upgrades to the Student Center to put it better in compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act. There were fees that are being either established or increased, one for the off-campus computer science programs and one for the alternative teacher-certification program, which you may have been hearing about. Then there were a variety of information items, annual reports and construction updates and all that sort of thing. So it was a fairly long agenda but it actually went pretty quickly. There wasn’t a lot of discussion about any of these items but I do have a whole book about it in case anyone has any detailed questions.

President Peters: I will attach to my State of the University Address charts and analysis of where the money went. I won’t attempt to deal with it in a narrative way but I will attach some charts. I think Fred Smith had his hand up. By the way, I saw you in the New York Times; also the Sycamore paper.

F. Smith: I’m curious about a capital item on the Stevens Building. You mentioned this was planning money for the Stevens Building, Sue, has there been any determination as to what the breadth of that planning will be at this stage and how much we’re talking about?

President Peters: I think I will have Dr. Williams handle this.
**E. Williams:** Yes, I’d be very happy to respond. The Stevens Building is certainly one area on the campus that we feel requires a great deal of attention. We have been working towards this for several years and, as you know, Fred, we have internally reallocated significant dollars to try to do some of the work and address some of the needs. The planning request will include dollars that will support the architectural design and conceptual design through construction drawings. The state system has three phases to it for any major capital project. The first phase is a planning stage, and typically universities will request planning funds for the first year. The second phase deals with the actual hard construction dollars based upon bids that are handled through the Capital Development Board, and then the third phase will include the request for specific equipment necessary for that facility. So we’re basically following the state guidelines. I have not seen a case that skips one of those steps, so we can be assured though that if we get the planning funds we will be to the point of construction drawings.

**President Peters:** I remember the numbers on that project. It’s about a 16-million-dollar project. That was a few years ago. The full planning money is about 1.4 million so that’s a substantial commitment on the part of the state to a structure. So if you get the planning money, that’s a pretty good indication. Last year, one of the first things I did was have local legislators on campus to view that building, and this past Monday we had representatives from the Illinois Board of Higher Education on campus and after a great meeting with them we showed them that building and Fred, you were there; it’s our top capital priority this year.

**S. Willis:** By the way, I do want to apologize if any of this was less than optimal. I was writing this report yesterday afternoon and was having trouble having two coherent thoughts in a row.

**President Peters:** Hearing no other questions we’ll move on to the BOT Legislative, Audit and External Affairs Committee. Judy and Jenine.

D. **BOT Legislation, Audit, and External Affairs Committee – Judy Burgess and Jenine Povlsen**

**J. Burgess:** No meeting was held.

**President Peters:** No meeting was held so this is an easy report. By the way, the Board of Trustees meeting is next Thursday, a full Board meeting, on the 20th.

E. **BOT – Dan Griffiths – report**

**President Peters:** Board of Trustees report. Who is this Dan Griffiths? Welcome, Dan.

D. **Griffiths:** Thank you. My report is on page 19. I’m not going to read it although I was very pleased to see the third item on there. I thought it was well deserved. I’d also like to mention, John, I guess I missed you at the reception, at the alumni reception before the game, the game; was excellent. I’m sorry I missed you.

**President Peters:** At the U of I game?
D. Griffiths: Yeah, at the U of I game.

President Peters: I was a happy guy.

D. Griffiths: Had a great turnout there.

President Peters: Yes, we did. I will say that our party was treated very well by the University of Illinois and we have very good relations with President Stukel and with Nancy Kantor, the new Chancellor; and Barbara and I got introduced at President Stukel’s tent and they said now don’t be hard on these people because they are alums, both of them. And he said, they’re smiling now but will they be smiling at the end of the game, to which I retorted, don’t be too sure. I sat with him the whole game.

D. Griffiths: I’ll answer any questions if there are questions.

President Peters: Let’s move on to Academic Policy Committee. Mary Larson.

F. Academic Policy Committee – Mary Larson, Chair

M. Larson: I have no report but we usually have things on our plate very quickly. If you’re on my Academic Policy Committee and not on GroupWise would you see me at the end of the meeting and give me your e-mail address.

President Peters: Anybody have a question or comment?

G. Resources, Space and Budgets Committee – Gary Coover, Chair

G. Coover: The Faculty Senate/University Council Committee on Resources, Space and Budgets, a joint committee, has had two meetings already this year. We meet with the Associate Vice President for Information Technology, Walter Czerniak. What the committee has actually done this far in its four years of existence is to receive information, for example, about budget recommendations made to the Board of Trustees, and their reception at the Board of Higher Education and the legislature. The committee has also received information from other administrators regarding technology, cost centers and relations with alumni and annuitants and the development program. Last spring the committee requested information on the plan for Wirtz Hall. That was one of our first real forays into space issues. On August 30th of this year we discussed the need to be more deeply involved in an earlier stage in planning and initiatives and to be more proactive. At that point in our discussion, President Peters finished one of his previous meetings and joined us for a half-hour of our meeting. He suggested that NIU needs to shape NIU priorities to take advantage of state priorities. Big priorities with legislature this year and probably in future years will be teacher training and also the access to university education. Enrollment management, whether to grow or not to grow, will be very important. He also asked that the Faculty Senate consider what we would like in terms of an honors program or college, and that issue was given last week by the Faculty Senate to the Academic Affairs Committee for initial consideration. By this time, Walter Czerniak, the Associate Vice President for Information Technology had arrived and the question he had been asked to respond to was the
fate of the faculty e-mail accounts that are on corn. He indicated that while there is now a newer
and better server available, as well as newer ways to access e-mail, the corn server is still in
operation and it will continue to be so for two or three years. That at the end of three years,
faculty members with corn accounts will be contacted individually and given options of how to
access their e-mail. Wally also informed us of new technology advances on campus just over the
summer. Of most interest to faculty is probably the 24-hour consumer service center. That’s at
753-8100. He indicated that improved training and supervision will improve accountability. He
also stated that the NIU residence halls are some of the most technologically advanced in the
country with Ethernet or DSL connections in every room. Residence hall occupancy is now at
100% and probably the attractiveness of our dorms has been very important in keeping
enrollment growing. The ITS goals for faculty support include further support of Blackboard,
access to site licenses that faculty want and need and getting on to Internet II. Questions about
the privacy of faculty work stimulated his statement that faculty clearly have a right to privacy
for their work on campus. He also stated that if anyone were going to look in on your computer,
you would be informed first unless there is a court order to make that information available to a
legal authority. ITS is working on providing accounts to alumni and annuitants. That was the
end of that meeting. I have another meeting to report on but if you have any questions about that
meeting, I would address them now.

The committee met next on Thursday, September 6th, that is last Thursday, with our new Provost,
Ivan Legg. Dr. Legg opened by stating that he is faculty oriented, that his goal is to have the best
faculty possible and that faculty salaries are a key issue. As he noted later, he doesn’t see
research and teaching as separate. Research, that is quality research, is an endeavor that helps
teaching. He noted that staff salaries are also a big issue. Provost Legg, sorry to talk for you,
noted major constraints, which include the great amount of the budget that is tied up in personnel
costs and the great amount of budget control that exists really at the college level – the level of
the college offices. He noted that the Joint Committee is a very representative body within a
very powerful faculty governance system. This suggests a model role for the Joint Committee.
The Joint Committee could collectively make recommendations each year for things that need
new monies from the state, program initiatives money for example. This model implies that we
would work as a committee separately from the Provost using information that we request and
that he readily provides us. We presented a somewhat alternative model, one of the Joint
Committee working more closely with the Provost, acting as a sounding board, a resource and a
means of getting the word out to the university community. I personally would like to see this
close working relationship for a couple of semesters at least, with a collaborative effort to assess
where we are now and where we might go in the future. Dr. Legg gave us further indications of
how we could begin this year being more of a recommending body. For example, what would
we recommend for programming initiatives to be submitted to the IBHE and legislature? Or, on
a more structured level, if we were given 1 million dollars, how would we recommend spending
it? We then discussed some of the issues that presently suggest themselves. For example, space.
Can we have some input as a community and as a governing body from our recommendations as
a committee? Say even in space planning; what is the status of the campus master plan? For
example, what are the occupancy and renovation plans for the buildings that are opening up in
the near future? Wirtz Hall for example, and Altgeld Hall. What influence the academic offices
and units have on space and building decisions? Another area is access. Are we moving fast
enough on building accessibility, for example an elevator for Gable Hall? Another area,
integration of annuitants into the life of the university and integration of student services into academic affairs. From the discussion a broad agenda is suggested that we could start with in October and November when we have our next meetings. We will meet on the first Thursday of each month unless alternative dates are needed to meet the schedules of the people we want to meet with. For example, we could have a broad meeting, soon, I hope, on space, buildings and accessibility and perhaps another on budgets and resources, teacher training, graduate programs and research support and requests for program initiatives. If you have suggestions on what we should do and what issues we should suggest, please do consider them and e-mail me at gcoover@niu.edu. I’ll bring them before the committee or you could throw out the concern on TomPaine, of course, and I do read TomPaine. That’s all I had. If there are any questions, I’ll address them.

**President Peters:** Comments for Gary? Questions?

**H. Rubin:** Yeah, I’m sorry if I heard this wrong. It wasn’t just yesterday; I’m going in and out and I see buildings and then I hear the meeting. I thought what I heard was the chief academic officer of the university suggesting that a primarily faculty committee take a more proactive role and then the faculty committee seeming to demur? Did I hear that wrong?

**President Peters:** No, you heard that wrong.

**G. Coover:** As far as what I said? I guess in a sense that is true. It’s really the format that’s the issue. We have a committee that I think is very representative if you look on page 17 and look at that committee. I think we’ve done a very good job this year of two things. One is getting a very good cross-section of the different colleges, for example. Another thing we have done is we’ve started fast and we got our committee together and we set up a schedule that can be met by most of the administration that we want to meet with. That is Thursday afternoons rather than the previously used Wednesday afternoons. This semester there are only two Wednesdays that are free. We have two meetings behind us already and three at least to go and what we need is information and we need it fast. We need that information provided to the committee in a format where we don’t have to put out subpoenas and get information, and then we pore over it and then try to come up with recommendations in isolation. But it sounds good for the long run and maybe we can get to that even by next semester, but I don’t think that’s what we need now. In a sense, this idea of putting forth a recommendation is one which we’ve tried to work on for the last several years and we can’t get together enough information. We haven’t had time to meet to put forth such recommendations without the information to make our own decisions. I don’t see that working together is necessarily in contradiction to making recommendations.

**President Peters:** It seems like you’re off to a good and fast start. Rules and Governance Committee, Susan Mini. It looks like we have an action item here.

**H.** Rules and Governance Committee – Susan Mini, Chair

1. **Changes** for Committees Book to Student Affairs Advisory Council and Student Affairs Professional Staff Advisory Committee.
S. Mini: Actually, I’m not as efficient as Gary. My committee has not met yet.

S. Willis: But you do have some changes for the committees book.

S. Mini: They’ve had the material but as a committee we have not met to discuss it. Simple changes though.

President Peters: So the status of these changes is they’re still being evaluated?

S. Mini: My committee has had the material. Certainly it’s a simple change from “student services” to “student affairs” and there’s an addition of the Director of the Students’ Legal Assistance Office. So, as far as the issues this committee has tackled, this is not a big one.

President Peters: Any questions on that item? All right, then let’s move on to the University Affairs Committee, Richard Orem.

I. University Affairs Committee – Richard Orem, Chair

R. Orem: No report.

President Peters: Let’s move on to Elections and Legislative Oversight. Winifred? Anyone reporting for her?

J. Elections and Legislative Oversight Committee – Winifred Creamer, Chair

No report.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

President Peters: Let’s move on to Unfinished Business.

A. Mail ballot provision for bylaw changes: in Rules and Governance Committee, from 5/2/01

President Peters: We have item A, mail ballot provision for bylaw changes. It’s in the Rules and Governance Committee.

S. Mini: Yes, that’s correct. We’re meeting Monday.

President Peters: You’re meeting Monday. Anybody want to make a comment; give advice? I think we know what the issue is.

B. Statement on professional ethics: in Rules and Governance Committee, from 5/2/01

President Peters: The statement on professional ethics. In the Rules and Governance Committee. Same deal? All right, very good.
J. King: Just a little question about that one. The minutes on page 12, in the second paragraph, refer to the possibility that the administration and other components of the university, other segments of the university, would be working up statements of professional ethics. Is there anything going on in that that we could hear about?

President Peters: I’m glad you asked that. I’d forgotten about that. What we did this summer, the first thing I did, was I asked our legal counsel to review the documents that already exist in Student Affairs and for faculty and staff, because embedded within those provisions are codes of ethics and conduct. Now that may be different than a philosophical ethical statement but we first want to do that; and then I’ve asked the Provost and the Director of Human Resources – once we get that legal kind of analysis of what is out there – to review this in light of the faculty statement. What I didn’t want to happen is the development of codes of conduct statements for students and employees that would run counter to what already exists in our Constitution. That’s where we are. That will probably take us all semester knowing how these things go. But the process is moving. We took the recommendation and gave it to some people to do some analysis. All right?

Now, New Business.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. University Council, past and future.

President Peters: A. University Council, past and future. You were going to refer it to a committee.

S. Willis: We did discuss this.

President Peters: If I remember the issue, what is the nature of the council? Is it a place for discussion and debate on issues, or is it a place to receive reports and affirm reports? I don’t want to simplify the debate too much. We were at the end of the year and we were ready to get on to research and summer things and so we held it over and I don’t think we took any actions or referrals to any committees or anything. We just had a good discussion on it.

S. Willis: We did discuss this last time in the Steering Committee and there was some thought that there was a desire to integrate our relationships with other committees of the university somewhat better because we were worried about duplication and lack of communication. I mean if you look at the Committees Book there are a lot of committees and we had the feeling we didn’t know what they were all doing. This would require some structural change, I think, where committees would not just send us an annual report, for example, but we would have some actual interaction. So probably that kind of thing would need to be dealt with actually by the Rules and Governance Committee.

President Peters: So if I’m reading what happened when the Steering Committee talked about it, we talked about it before. Right now it was brought up as an item of new business, but there
have been no referrals and no action so if we don’t do something today, does it disappear as an item?

H. Rubin: I move to postpone the item until the next meeting.

President Peters: All right, there’s a motion to postpone the item until the next meeting; carry it over. Is there a second? There is a second. Discussion on the motion?

H. Rubin: I simply made that as a procedural motion but I suggest that the Steering Meeting come up with some recommendations in terms of the actions that should be taken and since they aren’t ready yet, it was just done as a procedural motion.

President Peters: So the sense of the motion to postpone is to ask the Steering Committee to come back with some options.

J. Zar: That sounds fine. I would just remind the group that this is on the agenda because at the last meeting in May, the vote of the University Council was to put it on this meeting’s agenda for discussion. Most of the things that end up with a big discussion are brought to committee first and so the Steering Committee might want to look at it. We have already agreed we want to discuss it.

President Peters: So we have a motion on the floor. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? All right, the Steering Committee will come back for the next meeting with recommendations.

J. King: There is a crucial gap there because one of the officers of the University Council, an important one, is not on the Steering Committee and that is the President. So, I’m hoping that in addition to the Steering Committee discussing what is the mission of the University Council that our two officers will both get together and talk this through. Just a suggestion.

President Peters: I’m at the committee’s disposal.

B. Receipt of Annual Reports – memo (Page 22)

President Peters: Receipt of Annual Reports. I think that rather than going through each one of these, I’ll just indicate that they begin on page 22 and go through page 72 and if there are questions on individual reports, we can raise issues.

H. Rubin: Yeah, I read most of this, as much as I could; I don’t remember a thing I read but some of them actually report on things that really aren’t within our purview. In the Faculty Personnel Advisor’s report there were several suggestions made in terms of certain problems with potential intimidation on campus, academic freedom issues and other issues of that sort that Natalie was reporting on, and I don’t know what happens. We get a report and maybe the Rights and Responsibilities Committee, I don’t know which committee I’m on, somebody should look at that report in more detail because it is the council that would take actions based on some of her comments, and a lot of the other comments are just reports from committees that concluded their actions.
J. King: I think Herb is absolutely right, but I suspect this might be business that the Faculty Senate would want to take the leadership role in and then develop recommendations to be brought to this body.

H. Rubin: Yeah, okay, so then my suggestion is that we put it on the agenda of the Faculty Senate. Whatever keeps it alive until somebody looks at it.

President Peters: Does the body understand what we’re going to do? We’re going to ask the Faculty Senate to do what?

S. Willis: Look at the Faculty Personnel Advisor report and see how to deal with the issues that are raised in it.

President Peters: Do we need formal action on that?

S. Willis: I’ll do that.

President Peters: Exactly. We’ll trust Sue.

President Peters: Are there any questions on specific reports from these committees?

J. King: Not a question, just a statement of marvel I guess. I am looking at the report of the University Council Personnel Committee; by my math they took a look at 105 cases and all of these went through relatively smoothly. There is no statement here about any appeals. So I’m assuming that there just were no appeals. We can’t ask the sitting Provost about this as it occurred last year. From my point of view it’s a really rather amazing state of affairs. In the entire personnel process of the institution, with the UCPC being the body that handles the tough appeals, there weren’t any according to this report.

President Peters: I think that’s true for last year. I didn’t hear of any. Like you, Professor King, I thought that was pretty amazing. I was happy. I think what it means is somebody’s doing their job at the department level.

J. King: The other thing, if you could give me a minute. There’s something in here that was puzzling about the General Education Committee’s report. They noted the difficulty and frustration that faculty and department chairs had in filling out their reporting forms.

S. Willis: Where are you, Jim?

J. King: GEC starts on page 13 and goes through 15. It’s a pretty interesting report but several times they referred to difficulties that their people had, the faculty and chairs had, in working with their reporting demands. Is that correct? Can anything be said about this? Is this an exaggeration or am I just reading it wrong? I certainly don’t want to misread it.

President Peters: I think Bob Wheeler has a comment.
R. Wheeler: Yes, the General Education Committee is one of the six standing committees of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council and I do work with that committee. Part of the process of the General Education Committee is the evaluation of re-submissions of courses for the General Education program. We have about 150 courses in the General Education program and they are re-submitted for re-examination by the Gen Ed Committee on a regular cycle. In working with the committee last year, there were two areas where I felt that frequently departments had issues with the committee and there was some confusion and concern. One is the extent to which a consideration of multi-cultural issues is built into a course, and the second is the degree to which the department is assessing student outcomes in the course. Those two issues more than any other seem to be a focus for attention and debate. We continue to discuss the matter in the Gen Ed Committee. We had a workshop several weeks ago to attempt to instruct faculty in how to move expeditiously through the process, and at the September 20 of the committee next week we will hopefully come to some firm decisions about restructuring of the re-submission process. So the concern you raise is a real one, Jim. The committee is aware of it and is trying to address it and there will be further things to report down the line.

J. King: Thanks so much.

Annual reports were received from:

- Academic Planning Council (Page 23)
- Affirmative Action Diversity Resources Advisory Committee (Pages 24-28)
- Athletic Board (Pages 29-30)
- Campus Security and Environmental Quality Committee (Pages 31-32)
- Committee on Initial Teacher Certification (Page 33)
- Faculty Personnel Advisor (Pages 34-39)
- Graduate Council (Pages 40-42)
- Undergraduate Coordinating Council (Pages 43-58)
- University Assessment Panel (Page 59)
- University Benefits Committee (Pages 60-62)
- University Council Personnel Committee (Page 63)
- University Ombudsman (Pages 64-72)

IX. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

President Peters: Are there any comments or questions from the floor? Anything for the good of the order?

R. Wheeler: If I may, I’d like to make an announcement about an important event that will occur on campus a little over a month from now. As you know, the oldest academic mission of the university is the preparation of teachers and, at the current time, we have thirty-four certification programs on campus which enroll approximately 4,000 students. This responsibility is spread over four colleges: Education, Liberal Arts and Sciences, Health and Human Sciences, and Visual and Performing Arts. It involves about 150 faculty in a direct way and some of those are in the room at the present time. In mid-October the National Council for the Accreditation of
Teacher Education and the Illinois State Board of Education will send a team of eleven visitors to examine our certification efforts for re-accreditation. This is a process that occurs once every five years. It’s an important event for the university and some of you will be directly involved with interviews with members of the visiting team. They will particularly evident on campus on Monday, October 15, and Tuesday, October 16, and they may on an individual basis choose to talk to faculty or students who may be more or less randomly selected and I ask that they be given every courtesy and consideration should they appear at your doorstep, because that might happen. I am very proud of what we do here in our certification programs. This is an opportunity to showcase the great work that we are doing and we are certainly building toward a presentation of high quality in mid-October. One way in which we have tried to focus our approach to certification is by what we call our “conceptual framework” for teacher certification. We have prepared a small card that summarizes our approach in the conceptual framework and, with the permission of the Chair, I’d like to distribute copies of that card to members of the Council.

President Peters: Distribute away. Professor Wheeler, that was the most elegant bit of lobbying I’ve heard in my eleven months here; thirteen months. Anything else from the floor?

J. King: I’d like our minutes to show the sentiments of at least one of our members in commending the editorial board of the Northern Star for their editorial today which was both intelligent and conscientious and very responsible.

President Peters: All right, is this a formal motion?

J. King: No.

President Peters: I would say that I found this to be a great bit of journalism. I found it informative. The time line was good. Our Student Association President, Troy Caldwell’s statement made me proud that he is one of our students and I thought this was a good bit of journalism. At least this edition.

F. Bryan: Jim Killam should get the credit. He worked hard.

President Peters: This was a good editorial, although I don’t agree with all the editorials. On the same issue, a serious issue, remember tonight if you have the time, to show solidarity and support for our students. I believe the vigil starts at 8:00 p.m. at Central Park and then I think they’ll move it to MLK.

G. Gresholdt: We’re not certain about that.

President Peters: It may be contained. There is parking over by Stevenson Residence Halls. Our provost should know because he’s a resident of Stevenson Hall.

I. Legg: I invite you to come to my home.
X. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Article from Beacon News, “States change rules so community colleges can certify teachers” (Page 73)
B. Article from Courier News, “NIU offers fast track to prospective teachers” (Page 74)
C. Article from Inside Illinois, “UI looks for 8 percent increase in state funds for 2003” (Page 75)
D. Article from Beacon News, “Online issues topic of NIU conference” (Page 76)
E. Article from Daily Egyptian, “IBHE pushes for student input on fees” (Page 77)
F. Article from Syllabus, “Calculating the costs of Online Learning” (Page 78)
G. Meeting schedule for 2001-2002 (Page 79)

XI. ADJOURNMENT

H. Rubin: I move for adjournment.

President Peters: All those in favor?

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.